



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/829,169	04/09/2001	Stephen C. Vincent	P04860US0	8267
22885	7590	11/08/2004	EXAMINER	
MCKEE, VOORHEES & SEASE, P.L.C. 801 GRAND AVENUE SUITE 3200 DES MOINES, IA 50309-2721			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notification of Non-Compliance With 37 CFR 1.192(c)	Application No. 09/829,169	Applicant(s) VINCENT, STEPHEN C.
	Examiner Rodney G. McDonald	Art Unit 1753

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

The Appeal Brief filed on 20 August 2004 is defective for failure to comply with one or more provisions of 37 CFR 1.192(c). See MPEP § 1206.

To avoid dismissal of the appeal, applicant must file IN TRIPPLICATE a complete new brief in compliance with 37 CFR 1.192(c) within the longest of any of the following three **TIME PERIODS**: (1) **ONE MONTH** or **THIRTY DAYS** from the mailing date of this Notification, whichever is longer; (2) **TWO MONTHS** from the date of the notice of appeal; or (3) within the period for reply to the action from which this appeal was taken. **EXTENSIONS OF THESE TIME PERIODS MAY BE GRANTED UNDER 37 CFR 1.136.**

1. The brief does not contain the items required under 37 CFR 1.192(c), or the items are not under the proper heading or in the proper order.
2. The brief does not contain a statement of the status of all claims, pending or cancelled, or does not identify the appealed claims (37 CFR 1.192(c)(3)).
3. At least one amendment has been filed subsequent to the final rejection, and the brief does not contain a statement of the status of each such amendment (37 CFR 1.192(c)(4)).
4. The brief does not contain a concise explanation of the claimed invention, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawing, if any, by reference characters (37 CFR 1.192(c)(5)).
5. The brief does not contain a concise statement of the issues presented for review (37 CFR 1.192(c)(6)).
6. A single ground of rejection has been applied to two or more claims in this application, and
 - (a) the brief omits the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet presents arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
 - (b) the brief includes the statement required by 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7) that one or more claims do not stand or fall together, yet does not present arguments in support thereof in the argument section of the brief.
7. The brief does not present an argument under a separate heading for each issue on appeal (37 CFR 1.192(c)(8)).
8. The brief does not contain a correct copy of the appealed claims as an appendix thereto (37 CFR 1.192(c)(9)).
9. Other (including any explanation in support of the above items):

In regards to item 6(b) above Appellant has stated that "Claim 15 has an independent reason for patentability other than claim 16" and that "Claim 16 is not grouped with the other claims". The Examiner understands this to mean the claims 15 and 16 do not stand and fall together. However looking at Appellant's argument there is no separate argument as to why claim 16 should be consider separate from claim 15. The arguments in Appellant's sections D-F state that the applied art does not teach "discrete thin film chip resistors with moisture barriers" in reference to claims 15 and 16. There is not a separate argument for claim 16 and it is unclear if this argument is to be applied to both claims 15 and 16. It is suggested that if Appellant feels claim 16 is separately patentable to provide a separate argument for claim 16. It should also be noted that the Examiner understands from Appellant's Grouping of the Claims that Claims 1-5 are one group of claims, that claim 15 is another group of claims and the claim 16 is another group with each grouping having separate patentable reasons for distinction.



Rodney G. McDonald
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1753